Journal of Teacher Education and Educators
Volume 11, Number 1, 2022, 83-104

Preservice and Inservice Teachers' Language Ideologies about Non-Spanish-Speaking Students and Multilingualism in Chilean Classrooms

(Received on January 7, 2022 – Accepted on April 11, 2022)

Gloria Toledo[1], Andrea Lizasoain[2] and Karina Cerda-Oñate [3]

Abstract
This paper describes a study exploring in-service (IS) and pre-service (PS) teachers' language ideologies about non-Spanish-speaking students' multilingualism in Chilean classrooms. A survey was answered by 69 IS teachers and 34 PS teachers in the Chilean school system. Both groups were asked about two dimensions: (a) teachers' knowledge and training in L2 pedagogies and their ideologies about students' L1 and multilingualism; and (b) immigrant students' access and integration into Chilean schools. We focus on dimension (a); the results indicate that the teachers from the IS and PS groups do not consider that students' L1 is an impediment to the acquisition of the target language. They declare that the preservation of the L1 boosts non-Spanish-speaking students' self-esteem and can help them to acquire new linguistic knowledge. However, the results show a lack of consistent strategies to approach multilingual classes. These results are discussed in the light of the need to train teachers of all disciplines in multilingualism and the demand for public policies to teach Spanish as an additional language in Chilean schools.

Key Words: Intercultural education, language ideologies, Spanish as an Additional Language

Introduction

Immigration in Chile has grown exponentially during the last five years. In 2014, approximately 416,000 immigrants entered the country, equivalent to 2.3% of the Chilean population. According to a report by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Immigration (Departamento de Extranjería y Migración (DEM), 2020), in 2019, there were 1,492,522 immigrants, representing 6.6% of the total population. Notably, the largest immigrant communities were Venezuelan (30.5%), Peruvian (15.8%), Haitian (12.5%), Colombian (10.8%), and Bolivian (8%) (Departamento de Extranjería y Migración (DEM), 2020). Among these nationalities, the only group from a non-Spanish speaking country is the Haitian community.

Although Haitian immigrants are relatively few in Chile compared to those from other South American countries such as Venezuela or Peru, the majority do not speak

[1] Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, CHILE, gtoledo@uc.cl ,
ORCID: 0000-0003-1031-2844
[2] Universidad Austral de Chile, CHILE, andrea.lizasoain@uach.cl ,
ORCID: 0000-0002-2689-6728
[3] Universidad de Talca, CHILE, karina.cerda@utalca.cl ,
ORCID: 000-0002-0162-6836

Spanish[4], so it is particularly urgent to address their linguistic needs to encourage their successful integration into Chilean society. Importantly, school-aged Haitian children and adolescents account for 3.9% of immigrants. In this context, Espinosa et al. (2020) remark that Haitian students' situation is especially grave: the school community does not seem to value their identity, teachers lack appropriate pedagogical strategies to teach them, and schools do not receive government resources to help them. Language can either open or close doors; therefore, if immigrants do not learn the host country's language, they are deprived of opportunities to achieve what they have arrived pursuing, namely, quality of life. Ultimately, if they cannot communicate successfully in the target language, they are likely to be exposed to greater levels of vulnerability and marginalization.

Despite this pressing issue, Chile's linguistic and educational policies do not address the urgent needs of the Haitian immigrant community. The state has made efforts to strengthen the teaching of English as an additional language and has shown its acknowledgment of the value of additional languages for the inclusion of native languages in the school curriculum in order to revitalize the cultures of Chile's original peoples. In this respect, some public schools offer elective courses from first to sixth grades to learn about the languages and cultures of these groups—such as the Aymara, Mapuche, Rapa Nui and Quechua cultures—seeking to boost intercultural and inclusive education (MINEDUC, 2021a).

State initiatives to include English and native languages in the school curriculum show, among other things, that taking care of minority students' linguistic needs involves substantial challenges. However, both the advantages and disadvantages these students possess remain largely invisible in the Chilean school system. This phenomenon of invisibilization does not only occur in Chile. In Greece, for example, Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, and Tsokalidou (2015) report a similar reality. Teachers expect immigrant students to learn Greek on their own simply by being exposed to the additional language in the classroom, thus ignoring pedagogical strategies that would contribute to fostering a truly inclusive environment. This idea about additional language learning was commonly believed among schoolteachers in the United States as well (Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005), until the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) started to be implemented throughout the United States to help English learners improve their academic performance, which has proven to be highly effective (Short, Echevarría, & Richards-Tutor, 2011). The method focuses on producing comprehensible input and

[4] There are some cases of Haitian students who are already fluent in Spanish when they arrive in Chile because they have previously lived in Spanish-speaking countries, like the Dominican Republic. However, in this piece of research, whenever we mention Haitian students, we will be referring to non-Spanish-speaking Haitian students, because that is the scope of our research.

building highly interactive activities to foster both content and linguistic knowledge among ESL learners (Center of Applied Linguistics, 2022). Similarly, Canada has implemented the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach (Lyster, 2007), which addresses both disciplinary and linguistic knowledge simultaneously, giving students the necessary linguistic resources to understand disciplinary content (vocabulary and grammar) and learn the additional language. Australia has had a similar experience, where teachers of all disciplines are educated to address multilingual students' needs in all subjects to facilitate access to scientific knowledge (content and language) and, therefore, education (Ollerhead, 2019). This has been conducted through genre pedagogy. In all three cases, teachers receive adequate training for teaching multilingual lessons to include all students in the teaching and learning process.

Concerning inclusion, the Chilean state has devoted resources to fostering inclusive education. Yet, these efforts have only addressed students with special needs related to cognitive and sensory conditions, such as attentional deficit or deafness (MINEDUC, 2021b). Although some directors and teachers appear to believe that Haitian students have learning disabilities, confusing language difficulties with academic difficulties, recent research has confirmed that this is not the problem at hand (Toledo Vega, Lizasoain, & Cerda-Oñate, in press). Special education teachers accompany students with special needs in the classroom. In the absence of L2 language specialists, special education teachers also try to meet non-Spanish-speaking students' learning requirements. However, due to the lack of additional language learning policies and specific teacher education, most Haitian students devote their time in the classroom to drawing or looking at books (Espinosa et al., 2020). Another figure some schools depend on is the "facilitator," a Haitian proficient in Spanish who works as a translator/interpreter in the classroom. Notwithstanding, the teachers we have interviewed point out that their main contribution has been to convey relevant information to students' parents, who usually do not speak Spanish (personal communication, October 15 to 30, 2020). It has also been claimed that facilitators' work hinders Haitian students' learning processes because they are not teachers or they are not trained in L2 acquisition (Toledo Vega, Lizasoain, & Mena, 2021; Bahamondes, Flores & Llopis, 2021).

Moreover, these erratic, vague, and isolated linguistic and educational policies have not yet reached the national curriculum. Hence, no subject in the Chilean school curriculum includes learning objectives particular to non-Spanish-speaking immigrant children or youth. At the same time, in terms of teacher education programs, most do not train pre-service teachers to work with students whose first language is not Spanish. The same issue occurs with the government standards for pedagogy programs, which do not include measures to address immigrant students' needs[5]. Indeed, in-service teachers have reported possessing no skills to teach students who do not speak Spanish

[5] When this article was being prepared, the new standards for initial teacher training programs had not been introduced yet.

(personal communication, October 15 to 30, 2021). Thus, language becomes a barrier between teaching and learning instead of a tool to build knowledge.

Since Haitian students are deprived of the right to equal educational opportunities to develop skills in Spanish as an additional language, they are also restricted in their access to institutionalized knowledge in other disciplines, which is fundamental for social mobility (Bernstein, 1999). The origin of this problem lies in the "pervasive monolingual ideology and its deficit discourse" (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015, p. 60), which dominates many of the countries that have recently become destinations for mass migrations, including Chile. Stakeholders do not realize that Haitian students are in fact multilingual since many speak both Haitian Creole and French—even English sometimes—and are developing Spanish as a third language. Moreover, many will become Chilean nationals, and the state should not allow second-class citizenship. The political and educational actors involved lack a productive approach to this truth; instead, it seems that they would prefer multilingual students to lose their additional languages, favoring language attrition instead of language acquisition (Espinosa et al., 2020; Gkaintartzi et al., 2015).

This study aims to unveil what has remained invisible in the current Chilean school system and to eliminate the "deficit discourse" (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015) concerning Haitian secondary students in public schools, which focuses on lack of linguistic skills and content knowledge instead of what they bring from their cultures to enrich classrooms. This objective is linked to what Espinosa et al. (2020) call "linguistic justice.", namely, the right to speak the language you are most comfortable with and to be recognized as bilingual. In this vein, we seek to answer the following research question: "What are Chilean in-service and pre-service teachers' language ideologies regarding knowledge and training in L2 pedagogies and multilingualism in schools?" To answer this question, we adapted an interview conducted with Greek school teachers by Gkaintartzi et al. (2015) to explore pre-service and in-service teachers' language ideologies towards immigrant pupils' bilingualism. Our instrument was a 24-item online survey, including two dimensions divided into five subdimensions. The survey was answered by 34 pre-service and 69 in-service teachers from different disciplines throughout the Chilean school system.

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Language ideologies

Woolard (2020) defines language ideologies as moral and political representations of the use of language in society. To this, Irvine (2012) adds that language ideologies not only encompass a moral and political view about language but also about speakers and their discourse practices. Therefore, linguistic ideologies concern speakers' feelings and ideas about the role of language in an economic and political system based on their experience as social actors (Kroskrity, 2016).

Gkaintartzi et al.'s (2015) study serves to illustrate the construct of linguistic ideology. According to the authors, Greek school teachers focus on immigrant students' learning and adaptation difficulties. These teachers feel unfit to face diversity in the classroom and demand special training. They also complain about the lack of information about immigrant students, which contributes to ignoring their cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Gkaintartzi et al. add that most teachers have positive ideas about bilingualism. Still, they consider students' native language to be unrelated to school language learning and something that should only be used at home. In the same vein, teachers in Greece advise students' parents to speak only Greek at home and avoid interfering in the acquisition of Greek as a second language. Rhodes et al. (2005) reported similar practices in the United States, where some teachers used to believe that students' native languages would negatively affect their English acquisition and thus advise parents to only speak English at home, to which parents often agreed to prevent their children from being discriminated against. Nowadays, the educational community in the United States considers it to be a good practice to provide explicit teaching of both language and content for English language learners (ELL). In this sense, the SIOP method has been implemented in many public schools to both train teachers in the design of lessons that address ELL and boost learners' academic performance (Short et al., 2011). Despite this, Villamil, Munter, and Araujo (2021) report that ELL faces additional barriers in the USA school systems due to narrow linguistic policies, which devalue students' native languages due to the teaching of English.

Similarly, Espinosa et al. (2020) report that some teachers in Chile consider forbidding speaking Haitian Creole in their classrooms to be a sound pedagogical practice and advise parents to speak Spanish at home. These practices reflect language ideologies: implicit or explicit ideas about the languages people speak or do not speak or the places where languages should be spoken or not. In the case of Chile, the prevailing ideology appears to be that Spanish is the language of instruction and that there is no room for any other languages within the school context. To avoid negative attitudes towards learners' native languages, it is vital to render instructional pedagogy that highlights the importance of keeping and invigorating first languages among second language learners at school. On this topic, Mellom et al. (2018) show how training seems to mitigate the negative attitudes over learners' native language over time.

Spanish has been the de *facto* language in Chile since the 15th century, when the Spaniards conquered the country and forbade the use of the languages of the original peoples (Lizasoain, 2018; Farías, 2005, 1999; Mar-Molinero, 2000). Thus, many native tongues turned into second languages. The compulsory use of Spanish in the territories conquered by the Spanish crown was a policy meant to define and homogenize new nations' identities (Sologuren & Castillo, 2011; Mar-Molinero, 2000; Hamel, 1993). Indigenous people have been humiliated, discriminated against, and silenced in this context for centuries, giving way to the belief that Spanish is the only language

Chileans should speak and learn. This same ideology prevents many Chileans from understanding that some people do not speak Spanish simply because it is not their first language. In other words, it is taken for granted that everybody speaks Spanish, so it should not be necessary to teach it formally as an additional language. Thus, we can only make non-Spanish speakers' needs visible through linguistic policies and consistent planning to turn their needs into sound pedagogical practices in the school system.

Linguistic policies and planning have to do with choices made at a macro-level, which affect people at a micro-level (Romaine, 2021). That is to say, the state and society make decisions about language policies, which impact the speakers of different languages through their implementation and planning. Labeling a language as a first, second, additional or new language (Wang, 2015) is a decision that arranges languages in a hierarchy (Mar-Molinero, 2000), which means some will be considered more relevant or necessary than others. The design of sensible and sensitive linguistic policies and planning could change the harmful language ideologies encountered in Chile concerning Haitian Creole.

In this regard, it is essential to highlight that linguistic policy grants languages a certain status. In our work, we have referred to Spanish as a Foreign Language and Spanish as a Second Language, and now we are labeling it as an Additional Language. When a language is given the status of a foreign language, it is taught formally in a classroom; hence, it is part of the school curriculum. In Chile, English is taught as a foreign language in the school system from fifth grade onward (MINEDUC, 2021c). A second language is usually defined as a language that people learn after their first language or simultaneously, in a context of immersion; that is, it is often learned informally (Lizasoain, 2018). In technical terms, Haitian students supposedly learn Spanish as a second language, but in practice, many of them already speak a second language—French, the medium of instruction in the Haitian school system—so they would be learning a third language. Consequently, in this study, we propose that Spanish should be labeled as an additional language to favor a label that points at and highlights Haitians' multilingualism. Besides, according to Gardner (2010), labeling a language as "additional" boosts the motivation to learn the additional language, fosters a positive attitude towards learning it, and increases the efforts to learn it. If these three components are articulated effectively, learners are empowered to negotiate their identities in the processes of building their new multilingual identities in a better way (Gardner, 2010).

Language pedagogical knowledge

In multilingual contexts, teachers should be prepared to teach disciplinary content and the particular language of the discipline, as well as the basics for the development of additional languages (Toledo Vega, Lizasoain, & Mena, 2021; Espinosa et al., 2020; Rhodes et al., 2015). This preparation allows teachers to distinguish between additi-

onal language learners' lack of content knowledge and lack of linguistic knowledge (Ollerhead, 2019; Aalto & Tarnanen, 2015; Bunch, 2013; Mora, 2000; Nieto, 2001; Weigle, 1999; Cumming, 1986). In this context, language pedagogical knowledge is defined as the mastery of disciplinary language in the classroom context. It involves understanding that developing an additional language is a unique process and that language is both a learning resource and a teaching goal (Lizasoain & Toledo Vega, 2020; Aalto & Tarnanen, 2015; Bunch, 2013; Shulman, 1986). Aalto and Tarnanen (2015) have shown that teachers who have received training related to language pedagogical knowledge can distinguish between L2 learners' disciplinary knowledge and their linguistic skills, which helps them assess the work of learners better. On the contrary, teachers whose education has not included this type of training can demotivate or frustrate learners in their additional language development (Ollerhead, 2019; Papp & Rixon, 2018; Gibbons, 2015; Shaw, Imam, & Hughes, 2015; Weigle, 1999).

Therefore, language pedagogical knowledge has at least three aims (Ollerhead, 2019). First, to give teachers the skills to distinguish poor performance associated with disciplinary content from difficulties related to language (L1 or L2). Second, to allow teachers to implement teaching strategies that facilitate L2 learners' access to institutionalized knowledge, understanding what aspects students find challenging and for what reasons. Third, to help educators comprehend and respond to students' cultural diversity, turning their resources into learning opportunities for all the participants in the classroom. This approach also contributes to raising awareness in teachers about their linguistic ideologies and the impact these could have on their multilingual students. In consequence, it is essential to educate teachers based on this new paradigm.

Teacher education and language pedagogical knowledge in Chile

Rhodes et al. (2005) refer to four critical factors that explain the necessity for teachers who teach L2 students to have some theoretical background regarding second language acquisition and multilingualism, apart from language pedagogical knowledge. First, it helps eradicate certain myths about how children can best acquire a new language, such as the belief that the more they are exposed to the additional language, the faster they will learn it. Second, it helps to rule out ideas about L2 students' cognitive difficulties based on their poor performance (i.e., school practitioners sometimes refer immigrant students to special education when they only need to understand the language to perform as expected). Third, it helps to differentiate between low proficiency in the additional language and academic success. And fourth, it contributes to the adaptation of assessment to the needs of learners.

The teachers who have language pedagogical knowledge in Chile are mainly teachers of English as a Foreign Language. Given the current trends of immigration in Chile, one might also expect those language teachers who teach the subject of Language, Literature, and Communication in Spanish would have training in foreign language

development, but they do not. A recent examination of 61 teacher education programs in Pedagogy in Language and Communication (DEMRE, 2020) yielded that only one includes a core course in Spanish as a Foreign Language (Universidad de Magallanes, 2021). Two other programs offer elective courses on the subject, but only students highly motivated by the topic can be expected to take them (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, 2021; Universidad de Concepción, 2021). This indicates that pre-service teachers are not receiving the necessary education to meet the needs of immigrant children and youth who do not speak Spanish. Similarly, most in-service teachers did not receive any type of training in this area during their university years and have received little or no help from professional development programs to contribute to the learning of non-Spanish-speaking immigrant students (Lizasoain & Toledo Vega, 2020; Espinosa et al., 2020).

We know, then, that most teachers in the Chilean school system do not possess the necessary background to help Haitian students to learn Spanish or, in turn, to effectively access disciplinary knowledge. Therefore, they lack the competencies to help these students be part of the community. Of course, this is not the teachers' fault, but we must find solutions. As a step in this direction, and based on the factors above, we examined how pre-service and in-service teachers conceive their Haitian students' multilingualism to form a better picture of educators' linguistic ideologies.

Methodology

Type of study

This case study, which was conducted through convenience sampling and is of exploratory nature, aims to unveil schoolteachers' language ideologies, their knowledge and training in L2 pedagogies, and their ideas about multilingualism in the school context. Our interest was to know the perceptions of teachers within the Chilean school, regardless of the subject they teach. Case studies allow researchers to examine specific phenomena, which oftentimes have not been described before. Furthermore, results coming from case studies can be generalized and reinterpreted with time, which turns them into productive research samples. Our case study is focused on the language ideologies of pre-service and in-service teachers from different school subjects in the Chilean education system.

Data collection tools[6]

We adapted an interview protocol designed by Gkaintartzi et al. (2015) to assess Greek teachers' language ideologies concerning their multilingual students and turned it into an online survey. The structure of the survey is detailed in Table 1.

[6] The survey can be found here: https://forms.gle/rpxch92ze4scHwm78

Table 1.
Description of the survey

Type of question	Type of data	Type of analysis	Total number of questions
Information questions	Teaching and linguistic profile data	Descriptive qualitative analysis	9
Dichotomous yes/no questions	Quantitative: nominal: - 2 levels (yes-no): 4 questions - 3 levels (yes-no-I am not sure): 1 question	Descriptive Inferential statistics: chi-square	5
Open-ended questions	Qualitative	Content analysis	11

The survey described in Table 1 included two broader dimensions: Dimension A: teachers' knowledge and training in L2 pedagogies and teachers' ideologies about students' L1 and multilingualism; Dimension B: immigrant students' access and integration into Chilean schools[7]. In this paper, we focus on Dimension A, which was divided into two subdimensions, which are introduced in Table 2 below.

Table 2.
Dimension A and its subdimensions

Dimension A *Teachers' knowledge and training in L2 pedagogies and teachers' ideologies about students' L1 and multilingualism*	
Subdimension number	***Subdimension name***
1	Knowledge and training in L2 pedagogies
2	Multilingualism in schools and teachers' ideologies about students L1

In order to reclute participants, the survey was shared on social media networks (LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter) and was also sent via institutional emails to in-service and pre-service teachers.

[7] A manuscript about the results from Dimension B is currently under review.

Participants

The survey was answered by 69 in-service teachers (IS group) and 34 pre-service teachers (PS group) from different school disciplines and school levels. The IS group had an average of 9.13 years of experience while the PS were still students. In the IS group, 42% were elementary school teachers, and 40.5% were middle school teachers; the remaining 17.5% worked in preschool, special education, adult education, technical education, and as private tutors. In terms of their disciplines, 33% of this group were English teachers. The remaining were teachers of Mathematics, Spanish language, Social Sciences, Administration, Natural Sciences, Special Education, Preschool, Physics, Music education, Religious studies, Chemistry, Technology, and Technical Education, as well as primary school teachers covering more than one subject at school. In the PS group, 70.58% were high school teachers, 32.35% were primary school teachers, and the rest were special education teachers or preschool teachers. Among pre-service high school teachers, 47.05% were English teachers, and 43.35% were Spanish language teachers.

Data analysis tools

Due to the question types, which included information questions, dichotomous yes/no questions, and open-ended questions, the survey yielded both quantitative and qualitative data. In terms of the quantitative data, the dichotomous yes/no questions included the levels "yes" and "no" for most questions, except for one question, which had three levels: "yes," "no," and "I am not sure." These data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. For inferential statistics, the quantitative data from both groups were analyzed with SPSS (version 25, IBM Corporation, 2017). A chi-square test was performed to observe any group differences of the dependent variable at the nominal level.

Respecting the qualitative data, the open-ended questions were analyzed through Content Analysis. This type of analysis allowed us to explore and understand the experiences and perspectives of the participants from an emic point of view (Creswell, 2009; Dörnyei, 2007). Content analysis is characterized by following sequences in which topics are identified and encoded inductively from the collected data.

Findings

Concerning our findings, it is important to note that many participants in the PS group were training to be English teachers, so some categories may have emerged due to their specific training in L2 acquisition; likewise, in the IS group, English teachers accounted for 33% of the participants. Our main interest was to interview teachers from all disciplines and not to compare the IS and PS groups, so we decided to include the results from all participants, irrespective of the discipline they teach, even when the number of English language teachers was indeed significantly higher than the rest

of their peers.

Subdimension 1: Knowledge and training in L2 pedagogies

Information questions and yes/no dichotomous items

We summarize the results of the information questions and dichotomous yes/no questions from subdimension 1 in Table 3. In the case of the information questions, it is important to note that in Table 3 we only present the percentages of respondents who answered the question—for example, those who reported having knowledge of an L2 when asked "Do you have knowledge of an L2"—and then in the discussion, we provide specific information about the languages that were the most spoken among the IS and the PS groups.

Table 3.

Questions from subdimension 1

Type of question	Question	% of positive answers in-service group (IS)	% of positive answers pre-service group (PS)
Information question	Do you have knowledge of an L2?	76.8	85.29
Dichotomous yes/no question	Do you have experience in teaching an L2?	43.48	47.05
Information question	If you answered yes to question 5, please tell us the languages you have taught or are teaching.	N/A	N/A
Dichotomous yes/no question	Have you participated in any training to teach immigrants and/or multilingual youth/ children? Have you attended seminars related to this topic?	15.94	8.8
Dichotomous yes/no question	Have you had students who speak a minority language?	69.6	17.6

Regarding knowledge of a second language, the most widely spoken is English (76.81%), followed by Portuguese (15.9%) and Mapudungun (7.24%) in the IS group. It is worth mentioning that Mapudungun is the language of the most numerous native people in Chile. In the case of the PS group, 85.3% reported having knowledge of English as L2, followed by Mapudungun (11.76%) and Portuguese (8.8%). Meanwhile, 14.5% of the IS group and 8.8% of the PS group reported having no knowledge of a second language. Interestingly, more pre-service teachers (11.76%) reported speaking Mapudungun than in-service teachers (7.24%). This could be linked to the efforts of the state and private entities to revitalize our native peoples' languages.

In respect to experience in teaching a second language, 46.3% of the IS group reported having experience teaching English as a foreign language, while 50% of the PS group indicated the same. Meanwhile, 39.13% of the IS group reported having no experience teaching an L2, while 52.94% of the PS reported the same. Finally, only 7.24% of the IS group expressed having experience teaching Spanish as a second language, while participants from the PS reported no experience in this.

We used chi-square to test the independence of variables for the dichotomous yes/no questions. For the question *Do you have experience in teaching an L2?*, we examined the relation between the type of teacher (in-service and pre-service) and experience teaching a foreign language. The relation between these variables was not significant, $X2\ (1, N = 103) = .118$, $p > .05$. This suggests that the PS and IS groups do not differ significantly when it comes to teaching a foreign language; this would not be surprising since, as noted above, many of the teachers who were interested in answering the survey were pre-service or in-service English teachers. Even when pre-service teachers are not experienced teachers, university programs do send them to train at schools as student-teachers, so the experience they report likely stems from these on-site training periods.

In the case of the question: *Have you participated in any training to teach immigrants and/ or multilingual youth/ children? Have you attended seminars related to this topic?* we tested the relation between the type of teacher and the training received to work with multilingual students. The relation between these variables was not significant, $X2\ (1, N = 103) = .983$, $p > .05$. This indicates that the PS and IS groups do not differ significantly when it comes to training to work with multilingual students. This finding is interesting because it corresponds with the fact that teacher training still does not address the topic of multilingualism.

Relative to the question *Have you had students who speak a minority language?,* we explored the relationship between the type of teacher (in-service or pre-service) and experience working with children who speak a minority language. The relation between these variables was significant, $X2\ (1, N = 103) = 24.616$, $p < 0.01$. This finding points to what pre-service teachers also reported in the qualitative questions: since they are still in initial teacher training programs, they have little experience wor-

king at schools, which means they have generally encountered fewer types of diversity in the classroom.

Open-ended questions

In this dimension, there was only one open-ended question, *How do you deal with the fact that there are students in your class whose mother tongue is not Spanish and whose level of Spanish is lower than that of the rest of the class?* Concerning this question, we analyzed the responses through content analysis, from which three categories emerged: (i) access to education, (ii) resources and strategies, and (iii) language learning.

In relation to access to education, the IS group pointed out that non-Spanish-speaking students have not taken part in emergency remote teaching during the 2020-2021 COVID-19 pandemic, since most of them do not have the necessary digital resources to participate from their homes. This could mean that these students have not been exposed to Spanish, at least in an educational context, since the Covid-19 pandemic started in Chile in February 2020, because most of them speak only Haitian Creole with their families.

As for resources and strategies, the informants commented on the lack of educational resources in the school system. In this scenario, both groups declared that the strategies implemented in the classroom are the following: (i) to differentiate Spanish from non-Spanish speaking students; (ii) to adapt and/or simplify materials and methods (especially among the PS group); (iii) to use a vehicular language (English); (iv) to resource to non-verbal communication; and (v) to promote teamwork with the mediation of Spanish-speaking students. A strategy observed among the IS group was working jointly with the Spanish language teachers, because they consider their area closer to the field of second language teaching.

The strategies the IS group considered beneficial for working in multilingual classrooms were mostly related to the simplification of language, content, and methodologies. The strategy of adaptation was also found among the PS group. In fact, there were no specifications made regarding what types of adaptations could be implemented. Overall, results suggested a tendency among teachers to oversimplify the language and the contents of class activities, preventing students from receiving a quality education, which could further disadvantage non-Spanish-speaking students.

About language learning, only the PS group proposed training themselves in a specific L2 to understand their immigrant students better, while among the IS group it was stated that learners must acquire Spanish as L2. This latter group also commented on the need for support from trained professionals, such as educational psychologists and translators, to deal with non-Spanish-speaking students. Some had even asked for help from Haitian students as translators or tutors in classes. This is striking because educational psychologists' work is to understand how people learn and to help people

with learning difficulties; although their job is highly relevant, the difficulties of Haitian students, for example, are not related to learning per se, but rather are linked to low linguistic competence in Spanish. Similarly, the task of the translator is to make meaning in one language available in another language, which may be useful at points but is far from sufficient for the development of communicative competence in an additional language. Few of the participants mentioned the existence and relevance of experts in second language teaching and learning, such as teachers of Spanish as a second/foreign language.

Subdimension 2: multilingualism at school and language ideologies towards immigrants' L1

Open-ended questions

In this dimension, we had two open-ended questions, but we will discuss the results of only one of them, because it better fits within the scope of this piece. The question was: Do you *think it is important that the non-Spanish-speaking students in your class know their mother tongue well? For example, learning to read and write in their native language; justify your answer.*

Some emerging categories were the same as in subdimension 1, including (i) access to education, (ii) language learning, and (iii) resources and strategies. The new categories were (iv) self-esteem and self-confidence and (v) cognitive benefits of speaking more than one language.

In relation to access to education, the IS group commented that the Covid-19 pandemic has reduced immersion contexts and, therefore, non-Spanish-speaking students rarely interact with Spanish speakers. The Covid-19 pandemic has brought a new gap to prominence, the digital, which marginalizes Haitian students even more—the limited immersion contexts that online classes might offer are likewise inaccessible to most.

With respect to language learning, both groups deemed it necessary to have some familiarity with the L1 of non-Spanish-speaking students. Likewise, the PS and IS groups recognized the immigrant students' need to learn the target language as a means for integration, schooling, socialization, and a means of avoiding stigmatization. In addition, both groups valued minority languages and recognized the advantages of multilingualism, and both groups tended to positively regard students' L1 and comment on the importance of the maintenance of students' cultural roots. Most of the teachers (IS and PS) also asserted that the L1 contributes to learning, but some considered speaking L1 at home to reduce the chances of socializing with Chileans. Meanwhile, the IS group commented that the maintenance of the L1 should be a family decision, and the PS group considered that the teaching of the students' L1 cannot be imposed in schools. In this way, we can observe that both pre-service and in-service teachers tended to be respectful, in various ways, of their non-Spanish-speaking students' cultural assets.

This was often directly related to teachers' perceptions of the need to enhance learners' self-esteem and self-confidence. In fact, the IS group highlighted the role of language in the validation and valorization of cultural heritage, and the PS group expressed that the development of the L1 had a psycho-emotional impact on students.

Concerning resources and strategies, their scarcity was attributed to the school system, which does not consider the special needs a multilingual classroom requires. The PS group was silent on this point, as they did not have a prolonged and realistic experience in the school setting yet. Among the IS group, it was mentioned that the problem of teaching an additional language is related to the national curriculum, which does not allocate time or resources for that purpose. Both groups pointed to the importance of adapting the curriculum, but they did not specify how, nor why (except for the lack of time allotted) it impedes teaching Spanish as an additional language.

As for the value placed on multilingualism, the category of cognitive benefits of speaking more than one language emerged about this question: both groups believed that the development of the L1 can help in the learning of an L2. Nonetheless, there was divergence in terms of the ways in which multilingualism should be addressed within the classroom. Within both groups, some participants expressed the belief that it is necessary to learn the L1 of the learners. In contrast, others considered it more important for the learners to learn the target language.

Yes/no dichotomous questions

In this subdimension, there was only one yes/no dichotomous question, which is presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4.

Yes/no dichotomous question from subdimension 2

Type of question	Question	% of positive answers in-service group (IS)	% of positive answers pre-service group (PS)
Dichotomous yes/no question	Do you think that the fact that immigrant students continue speaking their mother tongue at home and/or at school hinders their learning of Spanish?	16.17%	15.15%

The analysis of this question yielded the following data: 16.17% of the IS group and 15.15% of the PS group held that speaking the L1 at home makes learning Spanish difficult, while 63.23% of the IS group and 54.54% of the PS group thought the contrary. On the same topic, 20.58% of IS and 30.3% of PS groups were not sure about this point. Even though the perception of maintaining and making use of the L1 was generally positive, a significant percentage of the interviewees either consider the L1 a hindrance to the learning of Spanish by immigrant students or are unsure on this topic, which is also relevant in terms of ideologies. We also ran a chi-square to test the independence of variables. We examined the relation between the type of teacher and their ideologies about speaking the L1 at home. The relation between these variables was not significant, $X2\ (2, N = 100) = 1.152$, $p > .05$. This indicates that the PS group and the IS group did not differ significantly in terms of ideologies regarding students speaking their L1 at home, which is positive considering that only a minority saw this linguistic activity as detrimental to learning.

Discussion

Results showed no significant differences between the PS and the IS groups concerning experience in teaching a foreign language, training to work with multilingual students or ideologies about students' L1. Both groups reported the same lack of training, which is worrying considering the waves of immigration that have occurred in Chile during the last 10 years. One would expect that today, initial training programs would offer some type of education in this topic, but apparently, the vast majority does not. Pedagogical experiences to approach the multicultural classroom in the United States, Canada, and Australia are worth exploring and testing in the Latin-American context (Toledo Vega, Lizasoain, & Mena, 2021; Espinosa et al., 2020; Rhodes et al., 2015).

We did not find any significant differences between the PS and IS groups in terms of ideologies about students' use of their L1 at home. In fact, as we noted before, most teachers regarded this positively and valued the use of the L1 in terms of cultural roots and background, as well as in terms of cognitive development. This is in line with the latest literature (Mellom et al., 2018; Irvine, 2011).

Regarding the qualitative data, different topics emerged from the content analysis. In terms of "Access to education," participants reported that it had been jeopardized by the mobility restrictions and hardships wrought by the Covid-19 pandemic, which will be difficult to overcome in the short term. Meanwhile, regarding "Resources and strategies" for dealing with non-Spanish-speaking students, participants mentioned the adaptation of methodologies and contents in a general way; thus, this topic needs to be further researched in order to see what kinds of adaptations teachers are making in this context and their impact on non-Spanish-speaking students. This is because some practices can be detrimental to language learning, as observed by Toledo Vega, Lizaso-

ain, & Mena (2021); Espinosa et al. (2020), and Glaintarzi et al. (2015). This finding is closely related to Zwiers' work (2007) about American teachers' practices to develop academic language in English learners who attend mainstream schools. Zwiers (2007) found, for example, that teachers either did not offer corrective feedback to validate the learners' backgrounds or overcorrected them to foster learning, to the detriment of academic development.

Another concerning finding is that teachers indicated that they needed the help of psychologists or translators to address their immigrant students' needs, without considering the assistance of specialists in SSL. This might be related to the idea that Language and Communication teachers are the ones who should be the experts in teaching Spanish as an additional language and that the acquisition of an additional language does not entail the learning of disciplinary knowledge. This is not only wrong but also perilous as shown by Bahamondes et al. (2021), Ollerhead (2019), Papp and Rixon (2018), Alto and Tarnanen (2015), Gibbons (2015) and many others. Disciplinary knowledge involves both content knowledge and the language that each discipline demands to build this content; thus, History teachers, for example, should be aware of the vocabulary and grammar with which their discipline builds knowledge in order to help learners to learn Spanish and History at the same time.

In relation to "Language learning," a positive finding that emerged was that many teachers in both groups (60.3%) believed that the use of the L1 is not an impediment to developing the target language. The latter contrasts with studies on teachers' language ideologies about language learning in other countries, such as Greece or the United States (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015; Rhodes et al., 2005), but also coincides with Mellom et al. (2018) and Short et al. (2011), who have found that teachers value their students' backgrounds. On the other hand, 15.84% of the informants believed that using the L1 at home may impair progress in Spanish.

Since several English teachers answered our survey, it is not surprising that most of our respondents are familiar with theories of second/foreign language acquisition and know that the development of the L1 can actually contribute to the learning of an additional language since it serves as a building block for new knowledge as well as preserve the identity of learners, thus boosting motivation to learn a new language (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2018; Canagarajah, 2017; Wang, 2015; Bhatia & Ritchie, 2014). This finding highlights the idea that all teachers should have some notion of how second languages are learnt regardless of their disciplines.

Respecting subdimension 2, *teachers' ideologies about students' L1*, only two novel topics emerged in this subdimension: "self-esteem and self-confidence," boosted by L1 development. This is a positive result because it indicates awareness that the classroom must be a safe space for learning, which can surely contribute to immigrant students' social inclusion and linguistic justice (Espinosa et al. 2020). However, teachers do encounter several obstacles to putting this knowledge into practice, beginning

with the national curriculum, which is highly restrictive.

Conclusion

In sum, Chilean pre-service and in-service teachers' language ideologies about immigrant students' multilingualism are favorable in the sense that they have positive regard for students' knowledge of more than one language. In addition, they feel that their non-Spanish-speaking students' L1 must be respected to preserve their cultural identity and background and to foster Spanish as an additional language, which indicates that they also value their students' discourse practices (Irvine, 2012). The problem lies in Chilean public educational policies, which have often lagged one step behind the country's educational realities. This is true not only of the curriculum but also of the teaching standards defined by the state for in-service and pre-service teachers[8]. Neither set of standards offers concrete, practical, and realistic tools or strategies to address the linguistic needs of immigrant students who do not speak Spanish, leaving teachers to improvise, using their intuitions as a moral and pedagogical compass.

Finally, our findings point to the importance of considering the pedagogical language knowledge that some pre-service and in-service teachers already possess. In this sense, we would like to suggest that, given the current state of things, a first step could be bringing initial teacher training programs in Spanish Literature, Linguistics and Communication and English as a Foreign Language closer, so pre-service teachers who will be joining the school system in the near future can obtain the necessary pedagogical language knowledge that their English peers already receive. Even so, these would just be the first steps, and further measures are strongly needed, because every teacher working in a multilingual school system should receive training in this topic.

Acknowledgements

This study has been funded by the National Investigation and Development Agency (ANID, *Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo de Chile*) through the Fondecyt Nr. 1190254 project "Haitian Secondary Students' Interlanguage Development in the Chilean Public School System" (2019-2022).

[8] Notably, Estándares de la Profesión Docente, Carreras de Pedagogía en Inglés, Educación Básica/ Media (MINEDUC, 2021d) and Estándares de la Profesión Docente, Marco para la Buena Enseñanza (MINEDUC,, 2021e).

References

Aalto, E., & Tarnanen, M. (2015). Approaching Pedagogical Language Knowledge Through Student Teachers: Assessment of Second Language Writing. *Language and Education, 29*(5), 400-415. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2015.1031676

Bahamondes, R., Flores C., & Llopis, M. (2021). *Guía metodológica para la comunicación intercultural con personas no hispanohablantes en las comunidades educativas.* Retrieved March 1, 2021 from: https://migrantes.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/sites/88/2021/05/GUIA-METODOLOGICA-PARA-LA-COMUNICACION-INTERCULTURAL.pdf.

Bernstein, B. (1999). Vertical and Horizontal Discourse: An Essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education 20*(2), 157-173. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01425699995380

Bhatia, T., & Ritchie, W. (Eds.) (2014). *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism.* John Wiley & Sons.

Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical Language Knowledge: Preparing Mainstream Teachers for English Learners in the New Standards Era. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 298-341. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12461772

Canagarajah, S. (Ed.). (2017). *The Routledge handbook of migration and language.* Taylor & Francis. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315754512

Centro de Lingüística Aplicada. (2022). What is the SIOP Model? In *Learn About SIOP*: https://www.cal.org/siop/about/

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* California: Sage.

Cumming, A. (1986). Some Thoughts on Practice, Policy, Theory, and Research in Language Teaching: A Conversation with HH Stern. *TESL Canada Journal,* 83-91. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v4i1.500

DEMRE (2020). *Oferta Definitiva de Carreras, Vacantes y Ponderaciones, Proceso de Admisión 2021.* Retrieved February 2, 2021 from: https://acceso.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Oferta-Definitiva-2021_16_09_20.pdf

Departamento de Extranjería y Migración (DEM) (2020). *Estimación de personas extranjeras residentes habituales en Chile al 31 de diciembre de 2019. Informe técnico: desagregación regional y comunal.* Retrieved August 10, 2021 from: https://www.extranjeria.gob.cl/media/2020/06/estimación-población-extranjera-en-chile-2019-regiones-y-comunas-metodología.pdf

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Espinosa M.J., Moyano C., Oyarzún, J.D, & Ávila, N. (2020). Justicia lingüística en la escuela chilena: el reconocimiento de la lengua materna como un vehículo para la educación. *Debates de Justicia Educacional,* 8. Santiago: Centro Justicia Edu-

cacional. Retrieved August 10, 2021from: http://centrojusticiaeducacional.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/debates-n8.pdf.

Farías, M. (1999). Hacia un modelo de las políticas de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras en Chile. *XIII Congreso de la Sociedad Chilena de Lingüística* (SOCHIL), 1-10. La Serena.

Farias, M. (2005). Critical Language Awareness in Foreign Language Learning. *Literatura y lingüística,* (16), 211-222. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0716-58112005000100012

Gardner, R. (2010). *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition: The Socio-Educational Model.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Gibbons, P. (2015). Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning. *Teaching English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom.* Second Edition. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Gkaintartzi, A., Kiliari, A., & Tsokalidou, R. (2015). 'Invisible' Bilingualism–'Invisible' Language Ideologies: Greek Teachers' Attitudes Towards Immigrant Pupils' Heritage Languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 18(1), 60-72. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.877418

Hamel, R. E. (1993). Políticas y planificación del lenguaje: una introducción. *Iztapalapa*(29), 5-39.

IBM Corporation. (2017). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0*. [Computer software]. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Irvine, J. (2012). Language Ideology. *obo* in Anthropology. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199766567-0012

Kroskrity, P. V. (2016). Language ideologies and language attitudes. obo in Linguistics. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199772810-0122

Lizasoain, A. (2018). El lugar del inglés como lengua extranjera en las políticas y planificación lingüísticas chilenas: ¿de dónde venimos y hacia dónde vamos?. *Lenguas modernas, 49*, 121-136.

Lizasoain, A., & Toledo Vega, G. (2020). Evaluación de la producción escrita de estudiantes secundarios haitianos por parte de profesores de Lengua y Literatura en Chile. *Estudios filológicos, 66*, 185-205. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0071-17132020000200185

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and Teaching Languages Through Content.* A Counterbalanced Approach. John Benjamins Publishing. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.18

Mar-Molinero, C. (2000). *The Politics of Language in the Spanish-Speaking World.* Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203443729

Mellom, J., Straubhaar, R., Balderas, C., Ariaild, M., & Portesa, P. (2018). "They come with nothing:" How professional development in a culturally responsive pedagogy shapes teacher attitudes towards Latino/a English language learners. Teaching and Teacher Education, 71, 98-107. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.013

MINEDUC (2021a). *Bases curriculares lengua y cultura de los pueblos originarios ancestrales. 1° a 6° año de Educación Básica. Decreto Supremo de Educación N°97/2021.* Retrieved March 1, 2021 from: https://www.curriculumnacional.cl/614/articles-143635_bases.pdf

MINEDUC (2021b). *Incorporación de Estudiantes PIE.* Retrieved March 1, 2021 from: https://especial.mineduc.cl/gestion-operacional-pie/documentos-apoyo-ingreso-pie/

MINEDUC (2021c). *Currículum nacional: Inglés. Unidad de Currículum y evaluación: Ministerio de Educación de Chile.* Retrieved August 10, 2021 from: https://www.curriculumnacional.cl/portal/Educacion-General/Ingles/

MINEDUC (2021d). *Estándares de la Profesión Docente, Carreras de Pedagogía en Inglés, Educación Básica/Media.* Retrieved August 26, 2021 from: https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/ingles.pdf

MINEDUC (2021e). *Estándares de la Profesión Docente, Marco para la Buena Enseñanza.* Retrieved August 26, 2021 from: https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/wpcontent/uploads/2021/08/MBE-2.pdf

Mora, J. K. (2000). Staying the course in times of change: Preparing teachers for language minority education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(5), 345-357. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487100051005003

Nieto, S. (2001). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives.* Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410605818

Ollerhead, S. (2019). Teaching across semiotic modes with multilingual learners: Translanguaging in an Australian classroom. *Language and Education, 33*(2), 106-122. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1516780

Papp, S., & Rixon, S. (2018). *Examining young learners: Research and practice in assessing the English of School-age Learners* (Vol. 47). Cambridge University Press.

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. (2021) *Malla de Licenciatura en Letras, mención Lingüística y Literatura Hispánicas.* Retrieved March 1, 2021 from: https://admisionyregistros.uc.cl/images/pdf/diagramas-curriculares/letras_hispanicas_9_2015.pdf

Rhodes, R. L., Ochoa, S. H., & Ortiz, S. O. (2005). *Assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students: A practical guide.* Guilford Press.

Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (2018). Multicompetence and multilingual writing. In R. Manchón, & O. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing* (pp. 365-385). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614511335-020

Romaine, S. (2021). Language Policy and Planning. *obo in Linguistics*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199772810-0273

Shaw, S., Imam, H., & Hughes, S. (2015). *Language Rich: Insights from Multilingual*

Schools. Cambridge: CUP.

Short, D. J., Echevarría, J., & Richards-Tutor, C. (2011). Research on academic literacy development in sheltered instruction classrooms. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(3), 363-380. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811401155

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*(2): 4-14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004

Sologuren, E., & Fadic, N. C. (2011). La lengua mapuche frente a una política indígena urbana: marco legal, acción pública y planificación idiomática en Chile. *Revista UniverSOS*, 8, 157-168.

Toledo Vega, G., Lizasoain, A. & Cerda-Oñate, K. (in press). Relevant factors to the evaluation of non-Spanish speaking Hatian students written production in Chilean public schools. *Scielo preprints.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-460x202153279

Toledo Vega, G., Lizasoain, A. & Mena L. (2021). Acquisition and Assessment of Spanish by Haitian Secondary School Students in Chile. *The International Journal of Learner Diversity and Identities,* 28 (1), 27-41. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-0128/CGP/v28i01/27-41

Universidad de Concepción. (2021). *Malla de Pedagogía en Español.* Retrieved March 1, 2021 from: http://educacion.udec.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Ficha_Ped-Español.pdf

Universidad de Magallanes. (2021). *Malla de Pedagogía en Castellano y Comunicación para Educación Media.* Retrieved March 1, 2021 from: http://admision.umag.cl/wp_admision/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/PED-CASTELLANO.pdf

Villamil, J. T., Munter, J.H., & Araujo, B. (2021). Best Practices for Teaching Latino English Learners in U.S. Schools. In E. G. Murillo, D. Delgado Bernal, S. Morales, L. Urrieta, E. Ruiz Bybee, J. Sánchez Muñoz, V. Sáenz, D. Villanueva, M. Machado-Casas, K. Espinoza (Eds.), Handbook of Latinos and Education. Theory, Research, and Practice (pp. 401-421). New York: Routledge.

Wang, X. (2015). *Understanding Language and Literacy Development. Diverse Learners in the Classroom.* Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Weigle, S. C. (1999). Investigating rater/prompt interactions in writing assessment: Quantitative and qualitative approaches. *Assessing writing,* 6(2), 145-178. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-2935(00)00010-6

Woolard, K.A. (2020). Language Ideology. In J. Stanlaw (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0217

Zwiers, J. (2007). Teacher practices and perspectives for developing academic language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 93-116. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2007.00135.x